

Mr. Speaker, this is a fundamental problem with our Nation's environmental laws and one reason why Americans overwhelmingly voted for reform of our environmental laws through their endorsement of the Contract with America. Two key provisions in the Republican reform package are cost benefit analysis and regulatory reform. We have seen with the superfund, clean water, pesticide, and clean air regulations a lack of consideration for cost in relation to benefit. For example, as I mentioned above Harrisburg and Lancaster, PA, have met national ambient air quality standards for 3 consecutive years. Nevertheless, these regions must comply with burdensome regulatory requirements to centralize automobile emissions inspections costing thousands of jobs across the Nation and adding Government cost and bureaucracy to the lives of many Americans. My bill is designed to ease the regulatory requirements of the 1990 Clean Air Act amendments and to direct the EPA to reassess its determination with respect to the centralized program and issue new regulations governing the program.

Mr. Speaker, we all support sensible environmental laws and cherish the natural and wonderful resources of this Earth. However, when the Government spends billions of taxpayer dollars on meaningless regulations which do little to improve the health of citizens we must take the necessary action to reform these laws. I ask my colleagues to mark this historic first day of the 104th Congress by cosponsoring this legislation and begin the process of regulatory reform.

INTRODUCTION OF THE LOBBYING DISCLOSURE ACT OF 1995

HON. JOHN BRYANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995, a bill to reform the lobby disclosure laws and to ban lobbyists' gifts to Members of Congress.

This bill is identical to the legislation that the House of Representatives passed on September 29, 1994, by a vote of 306 to 122.

The American people need to know whether this Congress will put an end to the perception that the Congress is captivated by special interests who shower Members with gifts to win their favor.

This bill would permanently bar lobbyists from gaining access to Members of Congress by picking up their tabs for meals and entertainment and it would end subsidies for what are essentially private vacation trips.

It would also ensure that our constituents know how much is being spent to influence the decisions that we are sent here to make on their behalf by closing loopholes in existing lobby disclosure laws.

As my colleagues know, Republicans sought to block consideration of this bill last year and succeeded in killing it with a filibuster in the Senate.

But the issue of how private interests seek to influence this body can not be ignored.

I urge the Congress to pass this legislation and help to restore the confidence of the American people in this institution.

LEGISLATION PERMITTING EX- PORT OF ALASKA'S NORTH SLOPE CRUDE OIL

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to rise to join my colleagues, Mr. THOMAS and Mr. DOOLEY, in introducing H.R. 70, legislation to permit the export of Alaska's North Slope crude oil.

For too long, the State of Alaska has been denied the opportunity to export this valuable resource. I look forward to working with the administration to move this bipartisan legislation to create jobs, to preserve a vital element of our domestic merchant marine, to raise State and Federal revenues, and to spur domestic energy production.

To put this proposed legislation in perspective, I think it would be helpful to explain the origins of current law. The export restrictions were first enacted in 1973 during the Arab-Israeli war and the first Arab oil boycott. Following the second major oil shock in 1979, the restrictions were further tightened, effectively imposing a ban on exports. Much has changed since then.

Over half of our imports now come from the Western Hemisphere and Europe. We are less dependent on the Middle East and Africa, but have shifted our purchases from Iran, Iraq, and Libya to Saudi Arabia and Kuwait. Today, U.S. oil supplies are ample and are more diversified. In addition, international sharing agreements are in place and the United States has filled a Strategic Petroleum Reserve with 600 million barrels of crude oil. In short, our Nation is not as vulnerable to the supply threats that motivated Congress to act in the 1970's.

While we have taken the steps necessary to reduce our vulnerability to others, we have not done enough to encourage domestic energy production. In fact, production on the North Slope has now entered a period of decline. In California, small independent producers have been forced to abandon wells or defer further investments. By precluding the market from operating normally, the export ban has had the unintended effect of discouraging further energy production. This legislation is designed to change that situation.

This proposed legislation would require the use of U.S.-flag vessels. Prior proposals would have permitted exports on foreign-flag vessels. Those bills never prospered, in part because they were opposed by the independent U.S.-flag tanker fleet that was built at considerable expense to move the crude oil to market. We have now forged common ground with the maritime industry. Our bill will help preserve this vital element of our merchant marine.

In June 1994, the Department of Energy issued a comprehensive report that concluded Alaskan oil exports would boost production in Alaska and California by 100,000 to 110,000 barrels per day by the end of the century. The sooner we change current law, the sooner we can spur additional energy production and create jobs on the west coast and in Alaska. In fact, Energy Secretary, Hazel O'Leary is reported as saying in today's Journal of Commerce, which I would like to submit for the RECORD, "I have been strongly in favor of lift-

ing that ban since I have been back in Government. You will see us carrying the initiative and supporting the lifting of the ban." I look forward to working with Secretary O'Leary and administration toward that end.

Mr. Speaker, as we enter a new era in the House, we have an opportunity to enact bipartisan legislation that will create jobs, help preserve our merchant marine, spur energy production, and raise State and Federal revenues. I urge my colleagues to work with me to enact this vital legislation as quickly as possible to achieve these objectives and to enhance our energy security.

[From the Journal of Commerce, Jan. 4, 1995]

O'LEARY PLANS PUSH TO END EXPORT BAN ON ALASKAN OIL

WASHINGTON.—U.S. Energy Secretary Hazel O'Leary said she plans to push this year to repeal the ban on exports of Alaskan North Slope oil.

Mrs. O'Leary also said she believed a broad coalition supporting the ban's repeal was forming late in the last congressional session.

"I have been strongly in favor of lifting that ban since I have been back in government," Mrs. O'Leary said. "You will see us carrying the initiative and supporting the lifting of the ban" in 1995, she said.

Deputy Energy Secretary Bill White has said the department will work on legislation to lift the 20-year-old law that keeps Alaskan North Slope oil from Pacific Rim markets.

Efforts by Alaska's congressional delegation to repeal the ban died late in the last session.

President Clinton also has indicated he supports the concept of repealing the ban, but that the administration was weighing the issue.

According to an Energy Department study, allowing the oil exports would generate jobs and revenue.

But some West Coast lawmakers opposed lifting the ban, partly fearing higher gasoline prices as less Alaskan oil would move to domestic ports.

Labor groups also have opposed lifting the ban because the oil would no longer be forced onto U.S.-flagged vessels, but could be carried on international vessels to overseas ports.

There have been proposals to require that the exported oil still be carried on U.S.-flagged vessels, but that could raise international trade problems, U.S. officials have said.

A QUESTION OF MURDER

HON. RANDY "DUKE" CUNNINGHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to call my colleagues' attention to a recent commentary from the News Reporter of San Marcos in the 51st District of California.

My constituent, D.J. Skinner Ross of San Marcos, raises some interesting questions about the recent tragic double murder of the Smith children in South Carolina. I urge my colleagues to read "A Question of Murder," as it offers a unique perspective on this sad case and on the larger issue of ethics in our society.